Features of Indonesian in Bandung

Michael C EWING
University of Melbourne

This article presents features of Indonesian as spoken in Bandung, West Java. The interactions investigated are predominantly in colloquial Indonesian, but also contain features that can be attributed to Sundanese, the dominant regional language in Bandung. These include phonological features, open word class lexical items, pragmatic particles, pronouns and kinship terms, other function words, and grammatical features. Different speakers display different patterns, frequencies and interactional practices with regards to Sundanese elements that occur in their speech. Individual speakers will also vary in their use of Sundanese elements in different contexts. Rather than defining a Sundanese variety of Indonesian, these various heteroglossic practices index a sense of localised identity. This in turn suggests that the investigation of regionally inflected Indonesian might more productively focus on speakers and what they do, rather than trying to define specific language varieties.

1. Introduction[1]

As the national language of a country in which somewhere between 350 (Cribb 2000:31) and 700 (Eberhard, Simons & Fennig 2019) different languages are spoken, Indonesian is part of a very complex language ecology. The language setting of Indonesia is conventionally described as multilingual (Chalmers 2006:164). The term multilingual has recently been critiqued because it can be understood as additive multiple monolingualisms (De Meija 2002; Heller 2007; Makoni and Pennycook 2007; Tamtomo 2018) That is, the assumption behind multilingualism has been that individuals speak more than one discrete language – in this case Indonesian and at least one regional language – and they will move from one language to the other according to the context in which they find themselves. Indonesian itself can be spoken in different ways, including the standard variety and informal varieties, and it is closely related to the many local varieties of Malay also spoken throughout the archipelago. The relationship between the standard language and these other varieties of Indonesian and Malay has conventionally been described as diglossic (Ferguson 1959; Sneddon 2003). The concept of diglossia has also been critiqued in ways similar to multilingualism in that it can also imply discrete language varieties that people move between according to context.

The perceived rigidity of concepts like multilingualism and diglossia has been countered by concepts such as heteroglossia and polylingualism. In the context of Indonesia, Maier (1993) builds on Bakhtin's (1981) work to analyse the development of Malay and Indonesian during the Dutch colonial period in terms of heteroglossia. Rather than positing discretely delimited languages, heteroglossia emphasises the variation and continua of usage practices that characterise language use and the social tensions that arise out of these practices (Bailey 2012). The concept of heteroglossia is particularly useful in linguistically complex societies like those of Indonesia. Mairer's (1993) claim is that in the social world of early colonial

[1] I would like to thank the organisers and participants of the Second International Workshop on Malay Varieties held at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies in 2018 for the opportunity to present and discuss an earlier version of the paper. Thanks to Enung Rostika, Asdit Leonitara, Refdinal Hadiningrat, Alfa Sholihatunissa and Hanni Nurliani for their contribution to recording and transcribing the data used here. I also thank two anonymous reviewers whose comments have helped improve this article. All deficiencies of interpretation and analysis are, of course, my own.

EWING, Michael C, 2020. 'Features of Indonesian in Bandung'. In Thomas J. CONNERS and Atsuko UTSUMI, eds. *Aspects of regional varieties of Malay*. NUSA 68: 51-66. Permanent URL: http://repository.tufs.ac.jp/handle/10108/94895 doi: https://doi.org/10.15026/94895

Netherlands India language use exhibited the highly variable, fluid and hybrid qualities of heteroglossia. The later colonial period saw the introduction of the concept of clearly defined separate languages, with reference to notions of standards and the introduction of government policy and educational programs that helped spread both the concept of separate languages and the concomitant idea that language can deviate from standard norms. Maier (1993) calls this contrasting approach to language use polyglossia – similar the multiple monolingualisms of a multilingual approach. A fairly rigid separatist approach to language practices in Indonesia continued under the Indonesian government after independence as part of its nation building project (Anderson 1983; Errington 1998a). The nationalist agenda has contributed to what Bakhtin (1981) calls the centripetal forces of language, in counter distinction to the centrifugal forces of localising practices.

More recently in the linguistic anthropological literature there has been a shift to speaking of polylingual practices. Similar to heteroglossia, a polylingual approach recognises the porous boundaries that naturally exist between named varieties of languages and emphasises the hybrid nature of language practices in societies with complex linguistic ecologies. There is a focus on how speakers – as social actors – deploy different linguistic (and other semiotic) resources as they work toward various communicative goals (Blommaert & Rampton 2011; Jørgensen 2008; Pennycook 2010; Tomtomo 2018). There is also the recognition – in contrast to the concept of additive monolingualism – that users may not be considered fluent in certain languages whose resources they have access too. In the present paper, I will continue to speak in terms of heteroglossia, while recognising the resonances with the polylangual literature. In line with such approaches, researchers have recently begun to explore the varied and hybrid ways that people use language in contemporary Indonesia. What we see then is that following the shift from a heteroglossic to polyglossic understanding of the Indonesian language ecology that occurred in the later colonial period and continued after independence, now in the post-reformation 21st century we can see a wider reacceptance of the heteroglossic reality. This shift is occurring both among researchers (e.g. Djenar, Ewing & Manns 2018; Goebel 2010, 2015; Tomtono 2012, 2018; Zent 2017) and also within the language ideologies of speakers themselves (see for example the discussion of speaker attitudes toward formal and informal Indonesian in Djenar (2012) and Ewing (2020)). This involves a re-evaluation of the varied relationships between government sanctioned standard Indonesian, localised Indonesian, other varieties of Malay, regional and international languages. These relationships have been shifting as the Indonesian language (in various manifestations) becomes increasingly used in a wider range of domains across the country (Cohen & Ravindranath 2014; Kurniasih 2006; Musgrave 2014).

In this paper I present linguistic features that are commonly used by young speakers of Indonesian in the city of Bandung, West Java. In particular, I look at features that are considered to derive from the Sundanese language and to index an identity associated with Sundanese-ness. It should be noted that while a heteroglossic approach to languages challenges the existence of discrete bounded languages, there is a clear recognition that the concept of separate languages has very real sociolinguistic and ideological import for speakers. It is therefore not only heuristically advantageous, but also sociologically appropriate to classify some linguistic resources as, for example, Sundanese, Javanese or Indonesian. This recognises the perceived provenance of linguistic elements as coming from socially recognised speech communities. At the same time, other elements may not (necessarily) be associated exclusively with one particular named language – whether due to the existence of cognates, borrowings or sociological processes that see the blurring of previously constructed boundaries. Errington (1989b) discusses the indeterminacy that can

exist between Javanese and Indonesian. A similar indeterminacy can occur in the language of people who speak both Indonesian and Sundanese.

When we discuss the features of Indonesian spoken in a particular locale, such as Bandung, the assumption might be that we are describing a particular nameable variety of Indonesian – say Sundanese Indonesian or Bandung Indonesian. The above discussion of heteroglossic language use and hybridity suggests that this might not be best way to characterise such a situation. In what follows I approach the features of Indonesian spoken in Bandung as linguistic resources that speakers deploy and to which particular social indexical qualities have accrued. Rather than demonstrating the existence of a particular language variety, the distribution of these resources in discourse can reveal varied patterns of usage both across and within individuals. To the extent that there are similarities across a number of speakers in how these resources are deployed, we may speak of a community of practice. The key argument of this study is that communities of practice, rather than named language varieties, form a more useful and ultimately more realistic way to approach the question of how Indonesian is spoken across the archipelago in contemporary Indonesia.

2. Data

The data for this study are from a corpus of audio recordings and corresponding transcripts made in Bandung in early 2014. They involve speakers aged between 18 and 25 years engaged in friendly, informal conversation. Eight recordings were used for this study, which comprise approximately three hours of talk. The recorded conversations involve from two to nine speakers and include all-female and mixed female-male groups. The majority of speakers consider themselves to be ethnically Sundanese and speak Sundanese, along with Indonesian, as one of their dominate languages. Other speakers consider themselves mixed Sundanese and some other ethnic group and a few self-classify as non-Sundanese. Individual speaker backgrounds are discussed further in relation to language practices in Section 4. Bandung is the third largest city in Indonesia, a major university city and an important centre for the creative industries. It is located 150km from Jakarta, the capital of Indonesian. Jakarta thus exerts a strong cultural influence on Bandung, yet at the same time Bandung maintains a strong sense of Sundanese identity

3. Key features of Indonesian as spoken in Bandung

When features considered to be Sundanese are regularly used while speakers are primarily speaking Indonesia, this could be considered instances of borrowing or of code-mixing. As discussed in Connors (this volume), conventional accounts of language contact suggest that borrowing could be expected in phonology and lexicon, particularly from open word classes, e.g. content vocabulary. The expectation is that borrowing is much less likely in areas of syntax and closed word classes, e.g. pronouns, function vocabulary. The concept of borrowing itself can, of course, be critiqued in the same way diglossia and multilingualism were critiqued above. Delving into discussions of borrowing and codeswitching assume levels of linguistic competence that are in turn based on a structuralist distinction between competence and performance. A heteroglossic approach focusses instead on social meanings of linguistic resources (Bailey 2012). In this section a variety of different resources which are considered by speakers to be of Sundanese origin or characteristic of Sundanese speakers of Indonesian are exemplified. In the Section 4, variation in how Sundanese resources are deployed and the implications of such variation for how we conceptualise locally inflected Indonesian are explored. Included are phonological features, open word class lexical items,

pragmatic particles, pronouns and kinship terms, other function words, and grammatical features.

All the examples presented are from transcripts of the natural conversational interactions that make up the corpus of this study. Transcription conventions follow Du Bois et al. (1993). In addition, elements that are considered Sundanese are underlined. These are based on research assistants' assessment of what they considered to be of Sundanese provenance. In other words, these are elements that the research assistants, who lived in Bandung and were speakers of Sundanese, felt provided a Sundanese quality to the interaction. Some of these words might be analysed differently by different speakers or be considered to have different provenance. *Mah* 'CONTRASTIVE MARKER' for example is also commonly used in Jakarta, and for some people in certain contexts may be considered a marker of Jakarta-ness, but for Sundanese speakers its use while speaking Indonesian is one of the most quintessentially Sundanese indexes of identity.

3.1 Phonological features

Sundanese shares many cognates with Indonesian. Unsurprisingly, there are often phonological difference in how these cognates are realised. One of the features of Indonesian spoken in Bandung is that from time to time such cognates are produced with pronunciation associated with Sundanese although a speaker is predominately employing Indonesian. This is illustrated in (1), in which both Asmita and Bayu use the Sundanese pronunciation *rebu* 'thousand' rather than Indonesian *ribu* several times. But note the Sundanese for 'one thousand' is *sarebu*, compared to the Indonesian *seribu*. Asmita and Bayu repeatedly produce a hybrid, *serebu* [sərɛbu], which combines an Indonesian pronunciation of *se-* 'one' and a Sundanese pronunciation for the base *rebu* 'thousand'. Asmita also uses the more standard Indonesian pronunciation toward the end of the example. This illustrates how such features are not fixed elements of a Sundanese variety of Indonesian, but rather are resources speakers use fluidly, and from which emerges a Sundanese inflected style of Indonesian. Another Sundanese element that occurs in (1) is the information flow particle *teh*, mentioned below.

(1)	Bayu:	*Terus pake= wadah,*	Then with the container,
		wadah itu berapa ya ben ya.	the container is how much man.
	Asmita:	*Se**rebu**lah.*	Say one **thousand**.
	Bayu:	*Se**rebu**.*	One **thousand**.
		*Dua **rebu**.*	Two **thousand**.
	Asmita:	*Eh tapi k- k- k- wadah teh mahal*	Uh but the container is expensive
		tahu.	you know.
		Nggak mungkin?	It's not possible?
		nggak mahal?	It's not expensive?
	Bayu:	*... Se**rebu**.*	One **thousand**
	Asmita:	*Se**rebu**lah yah?*	One **thousand** huh?
	Bayu:	*He-eh.*	Uh-huh.
		Itung dulu aja [*yah*].	Calculate it first okay.
	Asmita:	[*He-eh*].	Uh-huh.
		*Misalnya **seribu**.*	For example one **thousand**.
		*Jadi dua **ribu**=,*	So two **thousand**,
		.. modalnya.	the investment.

One of the most distinctive phonological characteristics of Sundanese is the phoneme [ɤ], a mid-back unrounded vowel spelled <eu> in Sundanese orthography. Not only does this sound not exist in Indonesian, but it occurs in only a few other languages of Indonesia (for example Acehnese) and so sounds particularly marked to many Indonesians. In the corpus used here,

this phoneme often occurs in particles which regulate interaction and information flow (see Chafe (1994:63) on regulatory and substantive units in language). In example (2), Bayu expresses agreement with the Indonesian particle *he'eh* [həʔə] 'uh-huh'. In contrast, Asmita produces the interactionally equivalent particle with Sundanese pronunciation as *heu'euh* [hɤʔɤ]. This further illustrates the fluid nature of Sundanese inflected Indonesian as Bayu incorporates some Sundanese pronunciation in (1) but uses Indonesian pronunciation in (2).

(2)	Bayu:	*KFC,*	KFC,
		He'eh.	**Uh-huh**.
	Asmita:	***Heu'euh*** [*yang itu*].	**Uh-huh** that one.
	Bayu:	[*He'eh*].	Uh-huh.

Sundanese, like many languages of Indonesia, does not have a genetically inherited labiodental fricative /f/. The phoneme /f/ in words of non-Sundanese origin have historically been pronounced [p]. This adaptation is not unique to Sundanese, and at the same time most speakers of Sundanese today – like speakers of Indonesian, which has a similar feature – are perfectly capable of producing [f]. Nonetheless the pronunciation of /f/ as [p] is something stereotypically associated with the social construction of Sundanese-ness. This can be seen in the joking self-parody by Didi in (3), in which she provides an exaggerated "Sundanese" pronunciation of *selfie*, and even adds explanatory commentary.

(3)	Didi:	*.. Udah.*	Okay.
		Udah.	Okay.
		Udah.	Okay.
	Rina:	*Jangan-jangan kamu selfie ya?*	I hope you didn't take a selfie.
	Didi:	*... Aku* ***selpi****,*	I took a ***selpi****,*
		pake P.	with a P.
		aku mah.	that's what I did.
	Fitria:	*Cie=.*	Oh wow.

3.2 Open word class lexical items

Sundanese lexical items from open word classes, such as nouns and verbs, often make an appearance in the Indonesian of speakers from Bandung. Examples (4) and (5) contain the words *pangjualkeun* 'to sell for someone' (in this case used to mean starting up a business with a friend), *rudin* 'uncouth' and *caludih* 'dirty'. They also contain the Sundanese particles *sok* and *mah*, discussed in Section 3.3. Note that (4) also contains the Jakarta-derived pronouns *gue* '1SG' and *elu* '2SG' and negator *kagak* (double underlined). These Jakarta forms help produce a creative and humorous contrast with the Sundanese *pangjualkeun* 'to sell for someone', in that use of resources from local languages can give a sense of provinciality, even a country bumpkin quality, while forms associated with Jakarta can produce an air of sophistication or bravado. Bayu is particularly adept at such creative deployment of language resources. While this is characteristic of his personal style, it is possible for him to do this smoothly and effortless precisely because of the flexibility provided by the highly heteroglossic inflection of language that is so common among most speakers of Indonesian.

(4)	Bayu:	*.. Des gue* ***pangjualkeun****,*	Des I'm **in business**,
		Sok elu makan kagak?	Come on will you eat (some) or not?

(5)	Rina:	*.. Pas awal,*	Right from the start,
		pas tahun awal-awal,	in the early years,
		dia emang kece.	he was indeed good looking.
		Sekarang mah,	Now [*mah*],
		*Makin **rudin**.*	(he's) getting more **unsophisticated**.
		*Makin= **caludih**.*	and getting **dirtier**.

3.3 Pragmatic particles

Sundanese, like many languages of Indonesia, has a wide range of discourse particles (Müller-Gotama 1994). As with discourse markers cross-linguistically (Schiffrin 1987), these range in function from regulating information flow, indicating affect and negotiating intersubjective alignment between interlocutors. (For discussion of these issues in Indonesian, see Djenar, Ewing & Manns (2018:64–104).) Some of the most common Sundanese particles that are regularly deployed within Sundanese inflected Indonesian are listed in (6). The particles *atuh*, *teh* and *sok* are illustrated in examples (7), (8) and (9). These and other particles are also found in many of the other examples.

(6) Sundanese particles in the corpus

atuh	you should know, mild reprimand
da	so, because of that, you know
euy	hey, vocative like *man*, *dude*
mah	contrastive topic
sok	let's, come one, go ahead (homophonous with *sok* 'often', see Section 3.5)
tea	resumptive definite marker; marker of presumed shared knowledge
teh	identifiable information
we	only, just

(7)	Wida	*... A=ku belum dikasih minum nih.*	I haven't been given a drink.
	Asmita:	*.. Sa=ma nih.*	The same here.
		Aku juga.	Me too.
	Amru:	@@ <@ *Ambil **atuh*** @>.	Just get something **already**.

(8)	Febri:	...(4.7) *Beauty Camera,*	Beauty Camera,
		... Colour Touch Effect,	... Colour Touch Effect,
		Twin Camera.	Twin Camera.
		*Twin Camera **teh**,*	Twin Camera [***teh***],
		yang gimana?	is which one?

(9)	Ferbi:	... (1.6) *Li=ne Camera=.*	Line Camera.
	Dinda:	*Aku ini dulu* --	First I'll –
	Febri:	*.. Line Camera **mah** alay.*	Line Camera [***mah***] is crap.

3.4 Pronouns and kinship terms

The use of pronouns from regional languages in Indonesian is a common phenomenon across the archipelago. Kinship terms are also commonly used for both address and second person reference, either standing alone or with names. It is common across the archipelago for speakers of Indonesian to use local kinship terms along with or instead of Indonesian terms when speaking Indonesian, and this is also very common in Sundanese-speaking areas. (10) lists the Sundanese pronouns and address terms which occur in the corpus used for this study. Rather than an exhaustive list of Sundanese terms of reference, this list is representative of the kinds of terms commonly used by people in Bandung at this time. Choice of Sundanese

(rather than Indonesian or other) term can be attributed to the intersubjective construction of alignment (and disalignment) between speakers (Djenar, Ewing & Manns 2018; Ewing 2020).

(10) Sundanese second person pronouns and address terms in the corpus

urang	1SG familiar
aing	1SG coarse
abdi	1SG polite
maneh	2SG familiar
sia	2SG coarse
anjeun	2SG polite
teteh, teh	older sister
kakang, kang	older brother
mang	uncle

In (11) Asmita uses the familiar first person pronoun *urang* to refer to herself. At other times in the interaction she refers to herself with the Indonesian familiar first person pronoun *aku*. In (12) Dani uses the coarse Sundanese first person pronoun *aing*. He uses this both in the set Sundanese phrase *ceuk aing* 'according to me', but also in combination with Indonesian *kata* 'word, say, according to' to repeat the same point: *kata aing* 'according to me'. Use of coarse Sundanese is particularly ascribed to male speakers. This may be more a matter of language ideology and cultural stereotype than an actual fact about usage, as there are instances of female speakers also using *aing* in the corpus.

(11)	Asmita:	*Tapi pas waktu **urang** pak- biki=n sendiri.*	But just when **I** made (it) myself.
		Eu= .. ya=ng .. ke-,	Uh the one,
		sesuai takarannya jadi berapa gela=s.	according to the measurement there were so many cups.
(12)	Dani:	*Mungkin harga=,*	Maybe the price,
		*paling maksimal ceuk **aing**.*	at the highest according to **me**.
		Kalau mau b- .. jualan sesuatu yang maha=l,	If (you) want to sell something expensive,
		*kata **aing**,*	according to **me**,
		buat anak kuliahan sepuluh ribu.	(it's) ten thousand (rupiah) for university kids.

The young speakers in the corpus examined here commonly use kindship terms meaning older brother or sister when referring to friends who are older, or considered metaphorically older due to a higher status. In (13) Rini is younger than both Hana and Aina, and she addresses both women with Sundanese *teh* 'older sister'. Note that in the English free translation 'sister Hana' would sound stilted, so the Sundanese term is used. In (14) Shena refers to her friend's boyfriend as *kang* 'older brother', which is probably how the friend also refers to her boyfriend, regardless of whether he is actually older than the girlfriend or not – due to his status as the male member of the pair.

(13)	Rini:	***Teh*** *Hana mah udah lulus yah?*	You (***Teh*** Hana) [*mah*] already passed right?
		TOEFL-nya?	The TOEFL?
		...(2.1)	
	Hana:	[*Alhamdulillah ya*].	Thank God yes.
	Aina:	[*Alhamdulillah ya*].	Thank God yes.
	Rini:	***Teh*** *Aina juga udah?*	You (***Teh*** Aina) also?
		... Nih geuleu=h [@@@@@].	This is irritating.
	Hana:	[@@@]@@	

(14)	Shena:	*Soalnya,*	The problem is,
		kamunya nggak main teru=s.	(you) don't ever hang out.
		.. Mainnya sama ***Kang*** *Agoy aja terus.*	(You) only ever hang out with ***Kang*** Agoy.

3.5 Other function words

Several other Sundanese function or closed-class words are also often used by speakers of Indonesian in Bandung. These include the negators *teu* 'NEG', *moal* 'NEG' and *can* 'not yet', seen in (15), (16) and (17) respectively, as well as the question tag *nya*, also in (16).

(15)	Asmita:	*Eh tapi gimana yah?*	Uh but what about it huh?
		... Laku ***moal****?*	(Will it) sell or **not**?
	Bayu:	*Laku lah kayaknya mah.*	(It will) sell it seems [*mah*].

(16)	Euis:	*Gapapa?*	It doesn't matter?
		Berefek ***teu nya****?*	It **doesn't** have an effect **does it**?
	Aina:	*Gapapa ah.*	Nah it doesn't matter.

(17)	Aina:	*... Tapi enak teh tarik.*	But *teh tarik* (a kind of tea) is nice.
		Can *pernah nyoba emang*?	(You) really have **not yet** tried (it)?

The Sundanese adverbs *sok* 'often' (18) and *pisan* 'very' (19) also commonly occur in Indonesian discourse, as do Sundanese demonstratives, for example *ieu* 'this' (20). Note that (20) also has another example of the Sundanese phoneme /ɤ/ <eu> in a regulatory particle, *yeuh*, which in Indonesian would more commonly be *ya*.

(18)	Bayu:	*... Jadi kalau misalnya dapet pangsit yang rata,*	So if for example (I) get a wonton that's flat,
		.. ***sok*** *.. kesel.*	(I) **often** feel disappointed.

(19)	Bayu:	*Tapi makaroni itu n-,*	But macaroni,
		godognya,	to boil,
		lama ***pisan****.*	(takes) **very** long.

(20)	Bayu:	*Wah jau=h* ***ieu*** *mah.*	Gosh **this** **[***mah***]** has gone far.
		Sesi balapan cinta ***ieu*** *mah yeuh Si Fandi?*	**This** [*mah*] is a love competition yeah Si Fandi?

The clause-linking particle *ari* 'if, given', which corresponds to Indonesian *kalau* 'if, given', is also commonly used by Sundanese speakers of Indonesian, as seen in (21).

(21)	Dewi:	*Nanti warisannya kaya,*	Later (you'll have) a large inheritance,
		.. turun temurun.	for your descendants.
		Ari *kamu sama Om Soma mah.*	**If** you're together with Om Soma [*mah*].

Sundanese has a rich array of expressives, particles that express the feeling of a particular concept (Klamar 2001). These expressive particles are conceptualised by speakers as onomatopoetically conveying the feeling of some action. These are often used in conjunction with the corresponding lexical verb that typically denotes that action and the use of expressives can convey an inchoative sense. In (22) Bayu uses the Sundanese expressive *bred* 'the feeling of doing something quickly' three times in succession to convey, in an otherwise Indonesian utterance, that he will take care of something very quickly.

(22)	Bayu:	*Ntar juga sama aku* ***bred bred bred*** *beres.*	Shortly I'll **quickly** take care of (it).

3.6 Grammatical features

Various aspects of Sundanese morphology can also make an appearance in the Indonesian spoken in Bandung. Two examples in the corpus investigated here include use of the verbal nasal prefix and the associative suffix. In varieties of colloquial Indonesian, the verbal nasal prefix *N-* can have a range of different expressions (Ewing 2005). When affixed to monosyllable bases, it is typically realised *nge-*. Pronounced as *nga-*, this can be a feature of Indonesian spoken in Bandung, as in example (23). This pronunciation has clear similarity with the realisation of the nasal prefix in Sundanese.

(23)	Febri:	*Mau* ***nga****cas dong.*	(I) want to charge (it)!

Also occurring in the corpus is the Sundanese associative suffix *-na*, which corresponds to Indonesian *-nya* or Javanese *-(n)e*. Unsurprisingly, this suffix occurs when speakers shift to speaking predominantly Sundanese and will be affixed to Sundanese bases. What is interesting is that it can also be "delinked" from a Sundanese environment and used on what are clearly Indonesian bases, as seen in example (24). Here it occurs in *mikirinna* N-pikir-IN-NA / VERBAL.PREFIX-think-APPLICATIVE-ASSOCIATIVE 'the thought'. While the form *mikir*, that is, verbal nasal prefix plus 'think', also occurs in Sundanese, the suffix *-in*, which derives from Jakarta Indonesian, is a clear index of colloquial Indonesian and indicates a base form associated with Indonesian and not (entirely) Sundanese. This is followed by the additional Sundanese discourse marker *teh* 'IDENTIFIABILITY PARTICLE', and Asmita then returns to Indonesian for the remainder of her turn. What is striking here is the seamless and fluid interweaving of Indonesian and Sundanese elements, even at the level of morpho-syntax.

(24)	Asmita:	*Pokoknya mah,*	The point is,
		yang packaging ya?	for the packaging right?
		Mikiri=n % --	Thought --
		*Mikirin****na*** *teh,*	**The** thought (is)
		kalau nggak p- --	if not --
		Jangan,	Don't,
		pokoknya jangan styrofoam.	the point is don't (use) styrofoam.

4. Deployment of localising features of language in discourse

Speech exhibits "varying degrees of otherness and varying degrees of 'our-own-ness', [which] carry with them their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework and re-accentuate" (Bakhtin cited in Coupland 2007:102). In the context of interactions among young people in Bandung, our-own-ness can be indexed through the use of linguistic resources that are associated with the local language, Sundanese. But it is important to bear in mind that this expression of our-own-ness is not in a simple binary contrast with Indonesian as an index of public, national identity. Indonesian itself can index both distance through a more standard style and closeness through a colloquial style, which is often described by young speakers as being more "communicative" (Smith-Hefner 2007:193). Colloquial varieties of Indonesian themselves can express both alterity and our-own-ness. The use of Jakarta-identified elements in the speech of non-Jakartan speakers, can be seen in different contexts as arrogant and distancing, or as humorous and creating a sense of shared engagement (Djenar, Ewing & Manns 2018; Ewing to appear; Manns 2011, 2014).

The complex hybridity of otherness and our-own-ness that can be produced by the heteroglossic deployment of different semiotic resources is illustrated in (25). Here Asmita and Bayu are speaking in a colloquial style of Indonesian that is inflected – as we have seen in many previous examples – with Sundanese elements, particularly discourse markers of various kinds. When Bayu turns to his friend Dian, who is walking by and has not been previously involved in the conversation, he continues to speak colloquial Indonesian and includes the Sundanese verb *pangjualkeun* 'to sell for someone' and the Sundanese hortative *sok*. At the same time, he now uses several elements understood to be Jakartan, marked with double underlining in the example – the pronouns *gue* '1SG' and *lu* '2SG' and the negator *kagak*. Bayu does not tend to use Jakartan elements when speaking with Asmita, and so their use here is simultaneously a marker of otherness in relation to Asmita, and also an indicator of solidarity (or at least an attempt at constructing solidarity) with Dian. In other examples we have seen the use of "foreign" lexical items from international languages, including Arabic and English (in (13) and (24) among others). These too can serve to mark both otherness and our-own-ness according to how they are deployed in a given interactional context. In large part, the sense of our-own-ness comes from the facility speakers share that allows them to fluidly and seamlessly work within and across linguistic resources with a variety of different socially salient provenances and which can be deployed with a range of different indexical effects.

(25)	Asmita:	*Eh tapi gimana ya*?	But what do (you) think huh?
		..(1.3) *Laku* ***moal***?	will (it) sell **or not**?
	Bayu:	*Lakulah* [*kayaknya* ***mah***].	(It) will sell apparently [***mah***].
	Asmita:	[*Target pasar*].	(We'll) target the market.
	Bayu:	.. *Di* ***gue*** ***pangjualkeun***,	Di **I**'m **in business**,
		Sok ***elu*** *makan* ***kagak***?	**Come on** will **you** eat (some) **or not**?
	Dian:	... *Ya nggak tahu.*	Yeah (I) don't know.
	Asmita:	[*Kok nggak tahu*].	What do (you) mean (you) don't know?
	Dian:	[*Enak ngga=k*].	Does (it) taste good or not?

One of the key points to arise from this discussion is that there is not a single language variety we can call Sundanese Indonesian. Instead, we have been looking at the deployment of resources that are commonly used in a community of practice in a Sundanese speaking locale. A reasonable question would be how common are these practices and are they used

equally be all members to the community? To get a preliminary sense of how these questions might be answered, Sundanese elements, as outlined in Section 3, were identified in the corpus. Frequency was then determined in relation to Intonation Units (IUs). Speech is broken into intonationally identifiable stretches, and I have broken the transcripts used in this study into IUs as defined in Du Bois et al. (1993), with each line of transcript being one IU, as presented in examples here. I then coded IUs according to whether or not they contained some identifiably Sundanese linguistic resources. The results are shown in Table 1, which presents the number and percentage of Sundanese inflected IUs relative to total IUs for individual speakers in the corpus. The final column of the table shows the ethnic self-identification of each of the speakers. The table is ordered from the speaker with highest percentage of Sundanese inflected IUs to the lowest.

Table 1: Frequency of Sundanese elements for each participant

Name	IUs with Sundanese elements	Total IUs	% IUs with Sundanese elements	Self-Identification
Dani	14	35	35	Sundanese
Bayu	109	491	22	Sundanese
Aina	15	74	20	Sundanese
Sita	33	165	20	Sundanese
Hana	16	84	19	Sundanese
Adib	7	38	18	Sundanese
Rini	21	114	18	Sundanese
Ratih	11	77	14	Sundanese
Unun	7	57	12	Sundanese
Alma	17	153	11	Sundanese
Febri	12	106	11	Sundanese
Wulan	20	190	11	Sundanese
Ratna	7	70	10	Sundanese
Rina	59	565	10	Sundanese
Dinda	35	474	7	Sundanese
Faizah	47	675	7	Sundanese
Salma	18	257	7	Sundanese
Didi	5	108	5	Sundanese
Asmita	49	1157	4	Sundanese
Amru	39	1002	4	Sundanese-Javanese, raised in Lampung
Rinal	4	112	4	Sundanese-Javanese, raised in West Java
Puji	17	597	3	Minang-Javanese, Javanese first language
Faizah	8	483	2	Sundanese
Wida	8	519	2	Javanese, raised in Lampung
Fakri	0	238	0	Makassar, came to Bandung for university

The most obvious and unsurprising result to notice is that all the most frequent users of Sundanese inflected Indonesian self-identify as Sundanese, with Sundanese-speaking parents and having grown up in what are considered to be predominantly Sundanese locations. All but one of the less frequent users of Sundanese inflected Indonesian ascribe some non-Sundanese quality to their background.[2] For example one or both parents are classified as coming from an ethnicity other than Sundanese and/or the participant was raised in a non-Sundanese area. It is significant to note then, that most speakers who do not identify as wholly Sundanese, but are now living in Bandung, do in fact incorporate some Sundanese elements into their Indonesian, albeit not as frequently as people who identify as wholly Sundanese. This highlights that the localisation of Indonesian is by no means exclusively tied to ethnicity, with speakers of non-Sundanese background also taking on elements of a Sundanese inflected Indonesian. Other-ness and our-own-ness become complex and layered as people whose life histories did not previously overlap with some form of Sundanese identity, now find themselves wanting to fit into the cultural milieu of Bandung and so take up elements of a Sundanese inflected Indonesian to index their alliance with their present location and its people. The complexities of how linguistic and other forms of accommodation to local social environment can play out in mixed-background communities are explored for a predominantly Javanese speaking area by Goebel (2010). Similar explorations of heteroglossic practices among other groups in Indonesia would be very useful.

Also key to the argument of this article is that when it comes to individual speakers, they do not have an invariant type of "local Indonesian". Individual speakers will vary in the frequency and kinds of Sundanese elements they use in relation Indonesian, and this use of Sundanese elements is part of a larger palette of resources speakers employ, which also includes standard Indonesian, colloquial and other regionally- or socially-inflected varieties of Indonesian, and other languages. Modulation between these different linguistic resources will be tied to current interactional needs involving such variables as interlocutor identity, topic, speech context and social actions being undertaken. One participant in the current study, Asmita, was involved in three different recordings in three very different settings. It is instructive to examine her use of Sundanese elements according to each recording setting. The data in relation to this are laid out in Table 2. This includes the number of Asimta's IUs that contain Sundanese elements out of the total number of IUs she produced in each of the recordings, along with a percentage. The final column briefly outlines the background of other participants in the event and their relationship.

[2] In the corpus, Faizah, who is Sundanese but uses relatively few Sundanese elements in her Indonesian, is interacting with Puji who does not have Sundanese background and is a first-language speaker of Javanese. Further research with both speakers would be necessary to understand their use of Sundanese elements, but a preliminary hypothesis would be that Faizah may be accommodation to Puji's less frequent Sundanese inflection of Indonesian.

Table 2: Distribution of Asmita's use of Sundanese elements across three recordings

Transcript	IUs with Sundanese elements	Total IUs	% IUs with Sundanese elements	Speech partners
Cream soup	44	441	10	Asmita – Sundanese Bayu – Sundanese Alma – Sundanese Abud – Sundanese *Good friends from University*
Plush Toys	5	499	1	Asmita – Sundanese Rinal – Sundanese-Javanese Amru – Sundanese-Javanese Wida – Javanese *Close friends (two couples)*
Just meet	0	217	0	Asmita – Sundanese Fakri – Makassar *Have just met for the first time*

What we clearly see is that Asmita modulates the level of "Sundanese-ness" in her Indonesian, depending on the context in which she is interacting. When she engages with close friends who all share a Sundanese background, as she does during the "Cream Soup" recording, the frequency of Sundanese elements is higher and reflects the relatively high frequency of Sundanese used by her fellow interlocutors. When she is with close friends who do not have a fully Sundanese background, as is the case in the "Plush Toys" recording, Asmita's use of Sundanese elements drops. Each of her interlocutors in "Plush Toys" does use some Sundanese, but not nearly as much as her interlocutors in "Cream Soup" (see entries for her interlocutors in Table 1), and Asmita's use of Sundanese elements drops in relation to this. Finally, in "Just Meet", Asmita is speaking to Fakri who is from Makassar and does not use any Sundanese elements in his speech. Asmita accommodates to this and also does not use any Sundanese elements in her speech.

It should also be noted that Asmita uses Sundanese elements less frequently than her friends in both "Cream Soup" and "Plush Toys". In "Cream Soup" Asmita uses Sundanese elements in around 10% of IUs, while her interlocutors use Sundanese in 11%–38% of IUs. In "Plush Toys" Asmita's Sundanese usage drops to 1%, while her friends use Sundanese in 2%–4% of IUs. A more detailed and statistically rigorous study would be needed to draw strong conclusions around these data, but the general point is that speakers do not mechanically match the amount of Sundanese they use to their speech partners, but rather modulate it in relation to both the interactional context and their own style preferences.

This closer look at who uses Sundanese elements and how this usage can vary in different contexts provides further evidence that there is not a fixed Sundanese variety of Indonesian. Rather, speakers deploy Sundanese elements as part of their repertoire of semiotic resources. Further, we have seen how these elements can be deployed in conjunction with a range of other elements. From this emerges a hybrid style of language use which can be modulated according the circumstances in which speakers find themselves.

5. Conclusion

Indonesian is spoken differently by people across the archipelago. Questions of how best to characterise local variants of Indonesian have recently come to the fore. This study has provided a preliminary overview of the range of resources that appear to be distinctive to a Sundanese style of Indonesian, at least as spoken by young people in contemporary Bandung. It has also taken a preliminary looking at how these resources are deployed by different speakers in diffident contexts. The main conclusion drawn is that it is not useful to try and identify a well-defined Sundanese variety of Indonesian, in contra distinction to, for example, Jakarta Indonesian, Javanese Indonesian or others. Rather it is much more useful to talk about locally inflected styles of Indonesian, recognising that these will vary from speaker to speaker and that each individual speaker will employ a locally inflected Indonesian differently in different contexts.

Identifying a community as multilingual – whether at the level of the Indonesian state or more locally as, for example, young people in Bandung – may also not be the most helpful way to characterise the complex linguistic ecology of Indonesia. It is more fruitful to think in terms of linguistic (and other semiotic) resources and how speakers deploy them. To the extent that patterns in usage appear among different language users, we can talk about this in terms of a community of practice or more specifically of discursive communities (Silverstein 2014). Such an approach focuses on people and what they do, rather than trying to define specific languages varieties. Locally inflected styles of Indonesian then emerge from the complex heteroglossic linguistics ecology of Indonesia.

Transcription conventions

.	Final intonation contour
,	Continuing intonation contour
?	Appeal intonation contour
--	Truncated intonation unit
-	Truncated word
@	One pulse of laughter
<@ @>	Words within these brackets are spoken while laughing
=	Prosodic lengthening
..	Short pause
...	Long pause
%	glottal sound
[yah]	Brackets for overlapping speech

References

Anderson, Benedict R. O'G. 1983. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Blommaert, Jan & Ben Rampton. 2011. Language and superdiversity: A position paper. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies* 70.

Chalmers, Ian. 2006. *Indonesia: An introduction to contemporary traditions*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Cohn, Abigail C. & Maya Ravindranath. 2014. Local languages in Indonesia: Language maintenance or language shift? *Linguistik Indonesia* 32(2). 131–148.

Coupland, Nikolas. 2007. *Style: Language variation and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cribb, Robert. 2000. *Historical atlas of Indonesia*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

De Meija, Anna-Maria. 2002. *Power, prestige and bilingualism: International perspectives on elite bilingual education.* Clevendon: Multilingual Matters.

Djenar, Dwi Noverini. 2012. Almost unbridled: Indonesian youth language and its critics. *South East Asia Research* 20(1). 35–51.

Djenar, Dwi Noverini, Michael C. Ewing & Howard Manns. 2018. *Style and intersubjectivity in youth interaction.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Du Bois, John W., Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, Susanna Cumming, & Danae Paolino. 1993. Outline of discourse transcription. In J. A. Edwards & M. D. Lampert (eds.). *Talking data: Transcription and coding methods for language research*, 45–89. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eberhard, David M., Gary F. Simons, & Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2019. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world.* Twenty-second edition. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: http://www.ethnologue.com.

Errington, J. Joseph. 1998a. Indonesian's development: On the state of a language of state. In Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard & Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*, 271–284. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Errington, J. Joseph. 1998b. *Shifting languages: Interaction and identity in Javanese Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ewing, Michael C. 2005. Colloquial Indonesian. In Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 227–258. London: Routledge.

Ewing, Michael C. 2020. Localising person reference among Indonesian youth. In Zane Goebel, Deborah Cole & Howard Manns (eds.), *Contact talk: The discursive organization of contact and boundaries in Indonesia*. London: Routledge. 140-159.

Ferguson, C.A. 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15. 325–40.

Goebel, Zane. 2010. *Language, migration and identity: Neighborhood talk in Indonesia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goebel, Zane. 2015. *Language and superdiversity: Indonesians knowledging at home and abroad.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Heller, Monica. 2007. Bilingualism as Ideology and Practice. In Monica Heller (ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach*, 1–22. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jørgensen, J. Normann. 2008. Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5(3). 161–176.

Klamer, Marian. 2001. Expressives and iconicity in the lexicon. In F.K. Erhard Voeltz & Christa Kilian-Hatz (eds.), *Ideophones*, 165–182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kurniasih, Yacinta. 2006. Gender, class and language preference: A case study in Yogyakarta. In Keith Allen (ed.), *Selected papers from the 2005 conference of the Australian Linguistics Society*. http://www.als.asn.au.

Maier, H.M.J. 1993. From heteroglossia to polyglossia: The creation of Malay and Dutch in the Indies. *Indonesia* 56. 37–65.

Makoni, Sinfree & Alastair Pennycook. 2007. Disinventing and reconstituting languages. In Sinfree Makoni & Alastair Pennycook (eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*, 1–41. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Manns, Howard. 2014. Youth radio and colloquial Indonesian in urban Java. *Indonesia and the Malay World* 42(122). 43–61.

Müller-Gotama, Franz. 1994. The Sundanese particles *teh*, *mah*, and *tea*. In K.L. Adams & T.J. Hudak (eds.), *Papers from the second annual meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*, 235–250. Tempe AZ: Arizona State University Program for Southeast Asian Studies.

Musgrave, Simon. 2014. Language shift and language maintenance in Indonesia. In Ruanni Tupas & Peter Sercombe (eds.), *Language, education and nation-building: Assimilation and shift in Southeast Asia*, 87–105. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2010. *Language as a local practice*. London: Routledge.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silverstein, Michael. 2014. How language communities intersect: Is "superdiversity" an incremental or transformative condition? *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 107.

Smith-Hefner, Nancy. 2007. Youth language, *gaul* sociability, and the new Indonesian middle class. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 17(2). 184–203.

Sneddon, James N. 2003. Diglossia in Indonesian. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 159(4). 519–549.

Tamtomo, Kristian. 2012. Multilingual youth, literacy practices, and globalization in an Indonesian city: A preliminary exploration. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 41.

Tamtomo, Kristian. 2018. Institution and market: Orders of multiple languages in Indonesian vocational education. *Multilingua* 37(5). 429–454.

Zentz, Lauren. 2017. *Statehood, scale and hierarchy: History, language and identity in Indonesia*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.